I cannot comprehend what the hon. member means by that statement. Apparently he knows the price of everything and the value of nothing. He continues:

> That is, my hon. friends in the social credit section of the house, make the claim that production is vastly in excess of consumption.

That is correct; we do maintain that production exceeds consumption, not only actually but potentially. He continues:

> ... that there is therefore a large surplus, and that this surplus could be distributed. During 1928 and 1929 there probably was a fairly substantial surplus; it went into savings.

I am at a loss to understand what the hon. member is talking about in this instance. Is he talking about money or goods? He says that through 1928 and 1929 there probably was a fairly substantial surplus. There was a surplus of what? Was there a surplus of money or a surplus of goods? Then he says:

> It went into savings, into investment, into expansion of plant. But if you are going to get a dividend out of the surplus you must first take it from the people who have it, tax it into your government and then distribute it again as a dividend.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has not made the statement correctly. Social crediters do not maintain that dividends can be obtained from existing income. If all incomes as they exist were distributed there would never be enough to buy the total of the goods offered for sale. He continues:

> I hazard this statement—I think it is capable of proof—that during the last few years consumption exceeded production.

What does he mean by that? Does he mean that we consumed goods which were never produced? I am very much tempted to repeat the words we often hear, "Consistency, thou art a jewel." I should like to take more time than I have taken, but the time is passing and I must turn to the last part of the hon. member's speech. He continues:

> They propose what has been called a cultural inheritance.

Social crediters have never proposed any such thing; the cultural heritage is here. It was obtained for us by our ancestors; we did not propose it. The hon. member continues:

> But I submit that we are getting our dividends right now.

I wonder whom he means by "we," when he makes the statement "we are getting our dividends." If he means the bankers, bondholders, and presidents of corporations, then probably he is correct. His remarks continue:

> It is paid to us. That is true of all the great inventions which we have. We are enjoying the dividends now.

I would ask the hon. member if he would dare go into the homes of unemployed or people who are living from hand to mouth, or living on subsistence incomes, and tell them that we are enjoying our dividends to-day? He concludes with this statement:

> I have touched lightly upon one or two of the problems in relation to social credit.

I think he was correct when he said that he touched lightly. Then he makes this further statement:

> It would be interesting if we had in this house a free discussion of the question, because I think there is nothing quite so easy as to puncture some of these bubbles.

I insist that the hon. member who composed this article is the one who is blowing the bubbles. He certainly cannot demolish the social credit theory with arguments of that kind. When he begins to attempt to demolish the social credit theory in that manner he has his head against a stone wall, and it will take a better head than his to move it.

An hon. MEMBER: Time is up.

Mr. KUHL: I think I have about ten minutes yet. An hon. member has suggested that time in this chamber costs $2,000 an hour. Well, I would like to suggest that much of the time which has been already spent in this house has been absolutely wasted. I think if the time taken up in the discussion of high or low tariffs had been spent in a discussion of the creation of money it would have been of far greater benefit to hon. members and to the people of the country generally.

I have not half finished my remarks, so I will content myself with dealing with the last portion of my address. I should like to say a few words with respect to the unemployed and work. During the course of the debate on measures respecting unemployment we heard a great deal of discussion concerning unemployment relief, old age pensions, pensions for the blind and for ex-service men. I think it is a shame that in this day and age we should be debating questions of that kind; they should be history. Economic security to-day, in this age of mass production, should be an established fact. We should not be debating as to whether or not the unemployed should have relief, or whether old age pensions, pensions for the blind or for ex-service men should be given. We should be debating the best type of policy which could be instituted to make the lives of these individuals most happy. I repeat that in this day and age economic security should be an established fact.

It has been often said during this session that we are struggling through a depression.